REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1-7 and 9-11 remain in the application, of which claim 1 is in independent form. Claim 1 and the Abstract have been amended by this Amendment.

Objections to the Specification

The Abstract was objected to because of certain informalities. By this Amendment, the Abstract has been amended to address the informalities and thus applicant believes the objection to be obviated, and withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,134,237 (*Brailean*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,195,093 (*Tarrab*). In addition, U.S. Patent No. 6,732,318 (*Collier*) is also cited to show the state of the art.

By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "generating a first datagram comprising message data and first redundancy check data." The first redundancy check data is "computed in dependence on the message data and the first address."

This feature is described in the specification of the present application as filed at, for example, the Abstract, and page 4, lines 15-20. Thus, the first datagram comprises both message data and redundancy check data. Importantly, the redundancy check data within the datagram is computed based on, or in dependence on, the message data and the first address.

As described in the specification, "[I]n this way, the first datagram comprises redundancy check data, which redundancy check data embodies information relating to the source of the message (first node address) and content of the message (payload)." (Specification at page 4, lines 20-23).

As understood by applicants, *Brailean* describes a system wherein data packets are transmitted from a first device to a second device, and each data packet contains a packet sequence number. (*Brailean* at col. 2, lns. 49-55). The first device increments the sequence number with each sent packet, and the second device responds to receipt of a packet with an acknowledgement data packet including a receiving tracking number, which is the number of the next expected data packet. (*Id.* at lns. 55-65).

Brailean does not describe, teach, or provide motivation for all of the features recited by claim 1 of the present application. For example, *Brailean* does not describe a method including "generating a first datagram comprising message data and first redundancy check data," and the first redundancy check data being "computed in dependence on the message data and the first address." In stark contrast, *Brailean* describes a system where redundancy check data (sequence number) is independent of the message data, as well as any first address (which is not even discussed in this context by *Brailean*).

In addition, *Brailean* does not describe the recited "generating a second datagram which comprises second redundancy check data, which second redundancy check data is computed in dependence on response data and the first redundancy check data." While *Brailean* does describe the use of a receiving tracking number, the receiving tracking number of *Brailean* is simply an incremented sequence number, and is not "second redundancy check data [that] is computed in dependence on response data and the first redundancy check data."

Tarrab does not cure the deficiencies of *Brailean. Tarrab* describes a method for generating communication errors in response to a transmitter exception. (*Tarrab* at Abstract). *Tarrab*, either alone, or in combination with any of the cited references, does not describe the features recited by claim 1, such as, for example, a method including "generating a first datagram comprising message data and first redundancy check data," and the first redundancy

check data being "computed in dependence on the message data and the first address," nor does *Tarrab* describe "generating a second datagram which comprises second redundancy check data, which second redundancy check data is computed in dependence on response data and the first redundancy check data."

Further, *Collier* does not cure the deficiencies of *Brailean* and *Tarrab*. *Collier* describes a method for generating and checking a cyclical redundancy check. (*Collier* at Abstract). *Collier*, either alone, or in combination with any of the cited references, does not describe the features recited by claim 1 such as, for example, a method including "generating a first datagram comprising message data and first redundancy check data," and the first redundancy check data being "computed in dependence on the message data and the first address," nor does *Tarrab* describe "generating a second datagram which comprises second redundancy check data, which second redundancy check data is computed in dependence on response data and the first redundancy check data."

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is deemed to distinguish patentably over any hypothetical *Brailean-Tarrab-Collier* combination.

Claims 2-7 and 9-11 depend from claim 1, that has been previously discussed, and are believed to be allowable and further narrow and define these claims. Therefore, claims 2-7 and 9-11 are also believed to be allowable.

Thus, applicants submit that each of the claims of the present application are patentable over each of the references of record, either taken alone, or in any proposed hypothetical combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections to the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Im
Registration No. 50,418

Date: 26 OCTOBER 2006

By: James Dobrow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,666

Mail all correspondence to:

Paul Im, Registration No. 50,418
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9627
Fax: (914) 332-0615